

Date: Wed, 22 Sep 93 04:30:12 PDT
From: Info-Hams Mailing List and Newsgroup <info-hams@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Info-Hams-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V93 #1126
To: Info-Hams

Info-Hams Digest Wed, 22 Sep 93 Volume 93 : Issue 1126

Today's Topics:

 9 WEEKS!!!
 Antenna Covenants AGAIN (but now with a twist!)
 ARRL wants info on Amateur Radio activity above 900 MHz
 CEPT license?
 Expensive application processes... (Was: Antenna Covenants)
 HTs Airlines and Morris
 Ramsey FX-440 kit information
 writing speed

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Info-Hams-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Info-Hams Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/info-hams".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Wed, 22 Sep 1993 04:30:29 GMT
From: cs.yale.edu!wsub.ctstateu.edu!ritterbus001@yale.arpa
Subject: 9 WEEKS!!!
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

> Hows this
>
> I sat my Ham licence on Saturday Sep 5th
> Got my results in the mail saturday Sep 12th
> On Monday morning at 8-30am I was at the door of our local
> Licensing Authority and by 9am I had been issued my Licence.
>
> Im ZL2WJP
>
> Hows that

> (Eat you heart out)
>

Well, I'm on the waiting list, but I don't expect to be on the air until sometime between Hallowe'en and Thanksgiving (US).

However, I just heard a very comforting rumor for the future testees, from a Very Reliable Source. Seems that starting in October, the FCC will begin testing of a program where the form 610s are electronically transmitted to them from the field (presumably the VEC), and that licenses should take only from 7 to 10 days!

Jim Ritterbusch

Date: Tue, 21 Sep 1993 20:42:10 GMT
From: sdd.hp.com!caen!math.ohio-state.edu!cs.utexas.edu!swrinde!
elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!ncar!elmore@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Antenna Covenants AGAIN (but now with a twist!)
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

While not covenants, Boulder County has added a new twist to its restrictive antenna ordinance: antenna height must be measured from the *LOWEST* point of the property. Thus, if your property changes elevation by 35 feet or more, you may not put a 35 ft antenna anywhere but at the lowest point and you may put no antenna at the highest point.

Given the ruling made by the Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals concerning Boulder's ordinance, the FCC needs to put a lot more teeth into a re-written PRB-1. Also, given the current state of affairs, it would be quite legal for Boulder county to have a zero allowed antenna height, allowing antennas only by variance. And, all they need do is point at a few examples of allowed antennas to show that they have not prohibited amateur antenna installations. Boulder County has taken the tack, supported by the Tenth Circuit, that all they need do under PRB-1 is allow access to the process; access does *not* imply that anyone and everyone may have an antenna. Rather, it only requires that they hear the applicant out. Based on whatever their "finding of fact" is, they can then deny the application with impunity.

PRB-1! Feh.

Note that I have redirected follow-ups to .policy.

Kim Elmore, [N50P, PP ASEL/Glider 2232456]

```

*  _.. _.. _.. _.. _.. _.. _.. _.. _.. _.. _.. _.. _.. _.. _.. _.. _.. _.. _.. _.. _.. _.. *
*   Said by NQ0I while working on his shack:                                         *
*   "All these *wires*! Why do they call it `wireless'!?"                             *
*  _.. _.. _.. _.. _.. _.. _.. _.. _.. _.. _.. _.. _.. _.. _.. _.. _.. _.. _.. _.. _.. _.. *

```

```

-----
Date: 21 Sep 93 17:04:06 EDT
From: psinntp!arrl.org@uunet.uu.net
Subject: ARRL wants info on Amateur Radio activity above 900 MHz
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

```

I have been asked to document Amateur Radio activity in the upper UHF and microwave bands. I would like to ask our newsgroup readers to email me information about their equipment and activities on Amateur frequencies starting with the 902 MHz band.

I would like few levels of responses:

1. A fast report on your equipment and activities. This can include digital modes, satellite, ATV, etc.
2. Immediate comments about your thoughts on the use of these frequencies, our future, the direction we are headed, the relative importance of the different modes (no CW wars, PLEASE!). This can include summaries of the things you are planning to do (or would like to do) when you get around to it, or a soapbox of the way you think things should be.

I will forward this information to several different people here on staff, for long-term use in our work before the FCC. Out of 45K readers, I should be able to get quite a few reports. Thanks to all who respond.

73 from ARRL HQ, Ed
N

```

-----
Ed Hare, KA1CV
American Radio Relay League
225 Main St.
Newington, CT 06111
(203) 666-1541 - voice
ARRL Laboratory Supervisor
RFI, xmtr and rcvr testing
-----

```

ehare@arrl.org

"You will never put the puzzle together
if you keep putting all of the pieces
back in the box." Colleen

```

-----

```

Date: Tue, 21 Sep 1993 19:13:28 +0000
From: news!demon!llondel.demon.co.uk!dave@uunet.uu.net
Subject: CEPT license?
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Sep20.163815.26681@atlas.com> tlanders@adcmail.atlas.com (Troy Landers) writes:

>
>
> Hi all. I haven't been on the net much lately, but I have a
> question for the European hams out there.
>
> I am an American who moved to Germany 8 months ago. I applied
> for and received a German ham license. I'm now DG5KAA (on 2-meter
> for those in the Koeln/Bonn area). Unfortunately, very little
> information about my license came with it. I am more or less
> familiar with German operational procedures (expecially after
> only *listening* for 8 months), but I have a more general question.
> Is my license a "CEPT" license. Can I use it all over Europe?
> If so, which countries can I use it in?
>

I would think that if you have a full German licence (as opposed to a temporary reciprocal one) then it is probably valid for CEPT purposes. The UK licence validation document has CEPT stuff plastered all over it so there is no doubt about that. The list of countries on my licence is:

A B CH D DK E F FL GR H I IRL L MC N NL S SF TCH ZL (and presumably GB, which they *don't* list :-)

Unfortunately the list is based on 'official' country IDs instead of prefixes :-)

You need to know which class of CEPT licence you have - that might restrict what you can do with it. Note that the amateur bands in some European countries is not as big as others, and AFAIK we all only have 2MHz at 2M and 10MHz at 70cms max.

Dave
--

* G4WRW @ GB7WRW.#41.GBR.EU AX25 * Start at the beginning. Go on *
* dave@llondel.demon.co.uk Internet * until the end. Then stop. *
* g4w1w@g4w1w.ampr.org Amprnet * (the king to the white rabbit) *

Date: Tue, 21 Sep 1993 20:18:56 GMT
From: brunix!pstc3!md@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Expensive application processes... (Was: Antenna Covenants)
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <9309211932.AA10879@maverick.aud.alcatel.com>,
mrzaz@maverick.aud.alcatel.com (Kris Mrzaz) writes:

|> He believes that a case can be
|> made to get PRB-1 substantially changed or rewritten to give it teeth
|> to prevent or overcome these kinds of covenants.

Well, I wish the ARRL would be a little more specific on what exactly is "reasonable accomodation". And I wish that the FCC would spend a little more time enforcing PRB-1 rather than make the common folks without the resources fund legal cases. Maybe if the FCC actually started taking some cities to court, and won big concessions, cities would start to wake up.

For example, in my town I wanted to put up a 55' crank-up tower. I live in an "R-1" zoned neighborhood (translated: NIMBY-city) which is composed of primarily single-family houses.

Well, the limit is 30' plus a 10' over allowance. In order to apply for a variance, I would have to:

1. Pay an "application" fee of \$500, plus an "advertising" fee of \$100.
2. Provide 10 copies of a 10-to-1 scale plot of all buildings, properties, district lines, zoning lines, etc., for everything within a 200' radius of my property lines.
3. Provide address labels for the owners (not occupants) of every piece of property shown on my plot.
4. Provide a certified "engineering study" of the structure I was going to erect, demonstrating its acceptable windload and falling perimeters. (this one was my favorite...)

On top of all this, I was informed that I should not even bother to apply if the structure would not entirely fall on my property should it collapse. Since I live on a 40x100' city lot, there is no way I can put something up which will fall within my property lines.

I figured out how much it was going to cost me (assuming I was granted my application and didn't have to 'appeal' at the rate of \$500/appeal), the total "cost" for the engineering studies, land plots, legal fees, research, etc., was close to

\$5,000

This, mind you, to erect an HDX-455, which you can buy from HRO for \$1,289. And, that's with no guarantee. I could have shelled out the dough and received a flat "no".

Okay, so let's forget the variance, right? Let's just put up a 40' structure instead? Easy, all you have to do is apply for the permit, right? Wrong.

Zoning board still wants me to provide items #2 and #4 above, along with my "application fee" of \$100.

Basically the zoning ordinances are set up specifically to prohibit you from setting up any type of amateur radio tower.

And spare me the "you should have checked before you moved there" line. I wasn't a ham, nor had any intention of putting a 55' tower in my backyard 5 years ago.

My answer: since the ARRL is "overwhelmed" by people seeking help from people, each of whom "think their situation is the most important", it's clear I shouldn't expect any help from the ARRL. Sure, their PRB-1 infopacket may be nice, but when I mentioned PRB-1 casually in my conversations with the zoning folks, they said "doesn't apply", and I don't have the dough to legally challenge them on their interpretation.

Instead, I'll buy an R-7 and put it on the roof (which is technically "illegal", since the antenna is 22.5' high and I can't have anything 10' over the peak of my roof...)

MD

--

-- Michael P. Deignan
-- Population Studies & Training Center
-- Brown University, Box 1916, Providence, RI 02912
-- (401) 863-2668

Date: 21 Sep 1993 23:41:39 GMT
From: topaz.bds.com!topaz.bds.com!ron@uunet.uu.net
Subject: HTs Airlines and Morris
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

The Captain did come on the intercom and announce that "transmitting devices" were not allowed to be energized while the plane was in the air due to FAA

regulations. (They did not cite which regulations in particular. Nor could they after the flight when I specifically asked the Captain on leaving the plane.)

Section 91.21. Why do you insist on causing trouble?

-Ron

Date: 22 Sep 93 07:02:30 GMT
From: seq!mcgough@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Ramsey FX-440 kit information
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Hello everyone,

I realize that the the subject of Ramsey kits has been hashed and rehashed in this newsgroup.

However, I'm wondering what successes/failures other hams have encountered with the Ramsey FX-440 (PC Board rev 1.4, 1/93). I've partially searched the mail archives at ucsd.edu and found limited specific information about this kit.

I've built an FX-440. It works. But, its overall performance is well below what I expected. I won't go into details now, but, I'm wondering if I've done something wrong (I've checked the component placement, soldering, etc. several times now) or if it's time for redesign.....

Has anyone had more encouraging results??

73,

David (kb4fxc)

Date: Tue, 21 Sep 1993 19:05:27 +0000
From: news!demon!llondel.demon.co.uk!dave@uunet.uu.net
Subject: writing speed
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

The trick is not only to write at 20wpm but to be able to read it afterwards!
:-)

Dave

--

```
*****
* G4WRW @ GB7WRW.#41.GBR.EU AX25      * Start at the beginning. Go on *
* dave@llondel.demon.co.uk Internet * until the end. Then stop. *
* g4wrw@g4wrw.ampr.org Amprnet * (the king to the white rabbit) *
*****
```

Date: 21 Sep 93 20:26:32 GMT
From: swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!math.ohio-state.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!
vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!moe.ksu.ksu.edu!cis.ksu.edu!mac@network.ucsd.edu
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <m9ro2cINNab8@news.bbn.com>, <1993Sep20.202415.3363@schbbs.mot.com>,
<CDpHDs.47D@cbnewsc.cb.att.com>du
Subject : Scratchi not real amchoor (was Who Wrote Scratchi?)

many have written:
>><Stuff deleted>
>>I don't know anything about Scratchi, but

Don't forgetting Scratchi not really amchoor, because he not ever getting
around to taking amchoor test. But that not saying he not making lots FB
QSOs on amchoor and TV bands and taking lots DX peditions to hills near
Fenix, Airizona, where he talking with forign amchoors all over hole world.

--Myron.

--

We preserve our freedoms using four boxes: soap, ballot, jury, and cartridge.
Myron A. Calhoun, PhD EE; Assoc. Professor (913) 539-4448 home
INTERNET: mac@cis.ksu.edu 532-6350 work, 532-7353 fax
UUCP: ...rutgers!depot!mac Packet radio: WOPBV@N0ARY.#NOCAL.CA.USA.NA

End of Info-Hams Digest V93 #1126
